

Review Form 1.8

Journal Name:	Journal of Advances in Medicine and Medical Research
Manuscript Number:	Ms_JAMMR_120115
Title of the Manuscript:	Prototheca spp. Infections in the Central Nervous System: Systematic Review and Drug Therapeutic Approaches
Type of the Article	Original Research Article

General guideline for Peer Review process:

This journal's peer review policy states that **NO** manuscript should be rejected only on the basis of '**lack of Novelty**', provided the manuscript is scientifically robust and technically sound. To know the complete guideline for Peer Review process, reviewers are requested to visit this link:

(<https://www.journaljammr.com/index.php/JAMMR/editorial-policy>)

Review Form 1.8

PART 1: Review Comments

Compulsory REVISION comments	Reviewer's comment	Author's Feedback <i>(Please correct the manuscript and highlight that part in the manuscript. It is mandatory that authors should write his/her feedback here)</i>
Is the manuscript important for scientific community? <i>(Please write few sentences regarding this manuscript to justify your answer)</i>	Although infection in humans is a rare disease, the manuscript succeeded in highlighting the importance of understanding the infection especially, since there's not enough information about it.	
Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)	Yes, but adding the word (human) to the title may be more representative	
Is the abstract of the article comprehensive?	Yes	
Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?	Yes	
Do you think the manuscript is scientifically correct? <i>(Please write few sentences regarding this manuscript to justify your answer)</i>	Yes, sufficient new references were mentioned regarding the collected data.	
Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestion of additional references, please mention in the review form.	Yes, most of them are recent except for a few references.	
Minor REVISION comments		
Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?	Good	
Optional/General comments		

PART 2:

	Reviewer's comment	Author's comment <i>(if agreed with reviewer, correct the manuscript and highlight that part in the manuscript. It is mandatory that authors should write his/her feedback here)</i>
Are there ethical issues in this manuscript?	<i>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</i>	

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Mennat-Elrahman Ahmed Fahmy
Department, University & Country	Theodor Bilharz Research Institute, Egypt